

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92111
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax
amandas@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Orlando Garcia,

Plaintiff,

v.

Chung Enterprises, L.P., a
California Limited Partnership;
Wuteh of China, Inc., a California
Corporation

Defendants.

Case No.

**Complaint For Damages And
Injunctive Relief For Violations
Of: Americans With Disabilities
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Orlando Garcia complains of Chung Enterprises, L.P., a California Limited Partnership; Wuteh of China, Inc., a California Corporation; and alleges as follows:

PARTIES:

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff suffers from Cerebral Palsy. He has manual dexterity issues. He cannot walk. He uses a wheelchair for mobility.

2. Defendants Chung Enterprises, L.P. and Wuteh of China, Inc. owned the real property located at or about 651 Kearny St, San Francisco, California, upon which the business "Fung Soong Massage" operates, in June 2021.

1 3. Defendants Chung Enterprises, L.P. and Wuteh of China, Inc. own the
2 real property located at or about 651 Kearny St, San Francisco, California,
3 upon which the business “Fung Soong Massage” operates, currently.

4 4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business
5 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their
6 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,
7 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.
8 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is
9 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary
10 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when
11 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants
12 are ascertained.

13
14 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

15 5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28
16 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with
17 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

18 6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause
19 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of
20 the same transactions, is also brought under California’s Unruh Civil Rights
21 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

22 7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is
23 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is
24 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

25
26 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

27 8. Plaintiff went to Fung Soong Massage in June 2021 with the intention
28 to avail himself of its goods or services motivated in part to determine if the

1 defendants comply with the disability access laws. Not only did Plaintiff
2 personally encounter the unlawful barriers in June 2021, but he wanted to
3 return and patronize the business several times but was specifically deterred
4 due to his actual personal knowledge of the barriers gleaned from his
5 encounter with them.

6 9. Fung Soong Massage is a facility open to the public, a place of public
7 accommodation, and a business establishment.

8 10. Unfortunately, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed
9 to provide wheelchair accessible paths of travel in conformance with the ADA
10 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

11 11. Fung Soong Massage provides paths of travel to its customers but fails
12 to provide any wheelchair accessible paths of travel.

13 12. A couple of problems that plaintiff encountered was that the ramp that
14 runs up to the entrance did not have a level landing. What is more, the ramp
15 had a slope of about 19%, which was too steep for plaintiff.

16 13. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the paths of travel that
17 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant
18 paths of travel available for wheelchair users.

19 14. On information and belief, the defendants currently fail to provide
20 wheelchair accessible paths of travel.

21 15. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff
22 personally encountered these barriers.

23 16. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use
24 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the
25 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

26 17. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and
27 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

28 18. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable

1 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with
2 disabilities.

3 19. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much
4 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the
5 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,
6 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous
7 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of
8 access if complete removal were not achievable.

9 20. Plaintiff will return to Fung Soong Massage to avail himself of its goods
10 or services and to determine compliance with the disability access laws once it
11 is represented to him that Fung Soong Massage and its facilities are accessible.
12 Plaintiff is currently deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the
13 existing barriers and his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers
14 on the site. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and
15 discriminatory barriers again.

16 21. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations
17 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are
18 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will
19 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this
20 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that
21 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See
22 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff
23 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his
24 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

25
26 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS**
27 **WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all
28 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

1 22. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
2 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this
3 complaint.

4 23. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the
5 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any
6 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone
7 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.
8 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 9 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,
10 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford
11 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
12 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the
13 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those
14 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 15 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is
16 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are
17 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- 18 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the
19 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are
20 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,
21 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the
22 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and
23 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the
24 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals
25 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

26 24. When a business provides paths of travel, it must provide accessible
27 paths of travel.

28 25. Here, accessible paths of travel have not been provided in conformance

1 with the ADA Standards.

2 26. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable
3 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the
4 1991 Standards.

5 27. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition
6 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily
7 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

8 28. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available
9 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

10
11 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**
12 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.
13 Code § 51-53.)

14 29. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
15 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this
16 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,
17 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,
18 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of
19 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.
20 Civ. Code §51(b).

21 30. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the
22 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

23 31. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the
24 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s
25 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,
26 privileges, or services offered.

27 32. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,
28 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each

1 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-
2 (c).)

3
4 **PRAYER:**

5 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide
6 relief as follows:

7 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the
8 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the
9 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not
10 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

11 2. For equitable nominal damages for violation of the ADA. See
12 Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski, --- U.S. ---, 2021 WL 850106 (U.S. Mar. 8, 2021)
13 and any other equitable relief the Court sees fit to grant.

14 3. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual
15 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

16 4. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant
17 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

18
19 Dated: June 29, 2021

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

20
21
22 By: _____



23 Amanda Seabock, Esq.
24 Attorney for plaintiff
25
26
27
28